

States in almost 3 decades, and I am proud to represent the district where our Nation's nuclear renaissance has begun.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have supported the expanded use of nuclear power as part of a comprehensive energy policy. Plant Vogtle will not only provide safe, reliable energy for Georgians, but it will also create the kind of good-paying jobs that we need.

The expansion of Plant Vogtle will create 5,000 jobs at the height of construction and 800 permanent jobs after construction is complete.

The Federal Government's guarantee is expected to save Georgia electric customers nearly a quarter of a billion dollars in interest expense—a direct dollar-for-dollar savings for Georgia customers, Georgia workers, and Georgia businesses.

This is exactly the sort of investment the Federal Government should be making. At virtually no risk to the Federal taxpayer, we save money for Georgia taxpayers as they pay for the infrastructure that will create good-paying jobs that support the lifestyles of virtually everyone else in the Georgia economy.

I commend all of the stakeholders for coming to this agreement, and I look forward to all of the good things that it will lead to.

HONORING REV. DR. LAFAYETTE FERNANDEZ CHANEY, SR.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, with great sympathy and sadness, I rise to pay tribute to the late Dr. Lafayette Fernandez Chaney, Sr., the extraordinary leader who touched the lives of many through his education and religious endeavors.

Under his leadership, Damascus Missionary Baptist Church in Houston experienced tremendous growth, both spiritually and financially. The beloved Rev. Dr. Chaney was requested to join our Lord on Friday, February 28, 2014; and he was 96 years old.

He gained his bachelor of arts and his bachelor of divinity from Paul Quinn, got a master of arts degree from Texas Southern University, studied for his doctorate at Baylor, and received his doctorate from Texas Southern University.

He was a teacher. He taught mathematics and science at Moore High School. He taught it in Waco at the Oakwood Elementary School. He taught at Waltrip Senior High School. He loved children.

He was someone who was a builder. He had professional memberships in a lot of educational associations. He was pastor at a number of churches, but his greatest gift and his greatest cherished memory was the pastorship for 50 years at Damascus Missionary Baptist Church.

Even when the church was without a home and he had to hold the congrega-

tion together to help build the beautiful church that we have, he was there to support and grow that church.

He, as well, was someone who enjoyed leadership in a variety of organizations and was courageous enough to appoint the first female minister at the Damascus Missionary Baptist Church, Evangelist LaSandra Easter.

I enjoyed, Mr. Speaker, my time with Pastor Chaney and visiting him at his last church commemoration—his anniversary and the church anniversary. It was my pleasure to be with him to share in the glory of the celebration of his wonderful life. He has run a great race. He has finished the course. He has gone on to receive his great reward.

I ask this body to have a moment of silence in his honor.

Thank you, Reverend Chaney, for being a great Houstonian and a great Texan and, yes, a great American.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the late Rev. Dr. Lafayette Fernandez Chaney, Sr., the extraordinary leader who touched the lives of many through his educational and ecclesiastical endeavors. Under his leadership, Damascus Missionary Baptist Church in Houston experienced tremendous growth, both spiritually and financially. The beloved Rev. Dr. Chaney was requested to join our Lord on Friday, February 28, 2014 as he departed this life at 9:30am. He was 96 years old.

Lafayette Fernandez Chaney, Sr., was born March 27, 1917 in Waco, Texas to proud and loving parents, Adell and Tom W. Chaney. He was educated in the public schools of Waco and Le Vega Independent School District, graduating from Moore High School in Waco, Texas.

Rev. Dr. Chaney received both his Bachelors of Arts and Bachelors of Divinity Degrees from Paul Quinn College. He received his Master of Arts Degree from Texas Southern University and studied in the doctorate program at Baylor University from 1968 to 1975. In August 1982, he received his Doctorate Degree in Higher Education from Texas Southern University.

Rev. Dr. Chaney taught mathematics and science at Moore High School in Waco, Texas for twelve years and was principal of Oakwood Elementary School in Waco, Texas for eleven years. From 1972 to 1986, he taught mathematics and psychology at Waltrip Senior High School in Houston. During the same period, he was an adjunct professor of mathematics and psychology for Houston Community College.

Reverend Dr. Chaney's professional memberships and honors include: past president of Waco Classroom Teachers Association, Waco Administrators Association and the Central Texas District Teachers Association. In 1965, he was nominated for "Who's Who" amongst professional men in Texas. He was a member of the American Association of University Professors, Phi Delta Kappa and Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternities.

He was pastor of the following churches: Little Tehuacana Baptist Church in rural Waco, Texas; Sweethome Baptist Church in Mexia, Texas; First Baptist Church in Thornton, Texas; Second Baptist Church in Itasca, Texas; Shiloh Baptist Church in Madisonville, Texas and served as Senior Pastor for 50 plus years at Damascus Missionary Baptist Church in Houston, Texas.

He served as Senior Advisor of the Youth Convention of the General Baptist Convention of Texas, Teacher of the Youth Department of the National Baptist Convention of America, Director of the Ushers and Nurses of the Independent General Association of Texas, member of the Evangelical Board of the General Baptist Convention of Texas, and President of Union Bible College in Houston.

His crowning glory was completing his life as Senior Pastor of Damascus Missionary Baptist Church. During this time, he successfully held the congregation together during the homeless years from May 25, 2003 through September 2, 2007, while the church's new home at its current location was being constructed.

Rev. Dr. Chaney also made history by appointing the first female minister at Damascus Missionary Baptist Church, Evangelist LaSandra Easter.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Dr. Chaney lived a consequential life and made a difference. He has run the great race; he has finished the course. He has gone on to receive his great reward: a place in the Lord's loving arms.

I ask that a moment of silence be observed in memory of the Rev. Dr. Lafayette Fernandez Chaney, Sr.

PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION THANK YOU

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud President Barack Obama for signing the Presidential proclamation recognizing March 2014 as Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month.

I would also like to give a special thanks to the 146 Members of Congress who signed onto the letter I authored and sent to the President requesting the issuance of this proclamation.

Finally, but more importantly, thank you to the colorectal cancer community who have given their time, sweat, and tears to raise awareness about prevention and early detection. Our efforts have not gone unnoticed.

This month, the highest office in the land, the President of the United States, brought national attention to our fight.

What better way to pay tribute by remembering those who have lost their battles to colon cancer, such as my late father, the honorable Congressman Donald Payne, Sr., who I followed into Congress, who lost his battle with cancer 2 years ago today.

This proclamation honors his memory and it honors those who are fighting the battle against colon cancer today.

MONEY AND POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of money

and politics. I address it knowing that many of my constituents and many Americans across the country are in a pretty bad mood about Washington, about politics as usual, about Congress.

They are angry because they feel like their voice can't be heard. They are frustrated because they feel like somebody else writes the rules, somebody else makes the policy, and their opinions on issues don't matter.

A big part of the reason for that frustration and that anger is they look out and they see these super-PACs and other Big Money campaign donors and PACs and special interests pouring money into Washington, pouring money into our political system.

They feel like those are the folks that call the shots here in Washington, that when it comes time for us to make public policy, too often the institution of Congress leans in the direction of the Big Money and the special interests and away from the priorities and the needs and the concerns and the demands of everyday citizens.

People are pretty smart. Americans are pretty smart. If they are feeling this way, there is probably a good reason for it. When you do the research, when you track the numbers, when you look at the amount of money that is pouring in here, it is no wonder that Americans have become cynical and angry and fed up and disillusioned. It is no wonder that the favorability rating—the approval rating of this institution is as low as it is.

Let's look at some of those numbers. In the 2012 election cycle, Big Energy—the big energy industry poured \$140 million into Congressional campaigns. That is in one election cycle. They spent another \$380 million on lobbying expenditures here in the city of Washington, here on Capitol Hill.

Wall Street, they were at the top of the list. Again, in one election cycle, in the 2012 election cycle, the financial industry contributed \$660 million to Congressional campaigns and spent another \$490 million—almost a half a billion dollars—on lobbying up here on Capitol Hill.

Sometimes, we ask ourselves—and I know my constituents ask me, and I know Americans raise this from time to time—how is it the case that an industry like the oil and gas industry in 2011 posted profits—the top five oil and gas companies posted profits of \$132 billion?

How is it that an industry like that continues to get taxpayer subsidies every year to the tune of \$5 billion? How are they able to preserve that loophole when they are making all those profits and they don't need that taxpayer subsidy? How does that come to pass?

Well, I just read you the numbers. If you are pouring \$140 million into campaigns and you are spending another \$380 million on lobbying, you can keep those loopholes in place.

Why can't we close some of these loopholes that Wall Street and the fi-

nancial industry enjoys? The same answer applies. Look at how much influence is coming from the money that pours in from those industries.

When Americans feel in their gut that somehow their voice isn't being heard and it is the interests of Big Money that rules the roost around here, there is a factual basis for that, and it is something that we need to address.

□ 1530

Whatever the priority is that Americans care about—whether it is jobs and the budget, whether it is health care and education, whether it is protecting our environment, whether it is reining in the influence of Wall Street and making sure that important regulations are in place—whatever the priority is that Americans want to see, the fact of the matter is that Big Money gets in the way of those priorities. It pours into campaigns; it pours into lobbying shops; and it stops often coming out of the gate these priorities that everyday Americans put at the top of their lists. It is no wonder that so many Americans are fed up. In fact, when you talk to them, when you get them to start talking about how they really feel, the fact of the matter is that many are downright disgusted by the influence that Big Money has on our politics and on our government.

We have got figure out what to do about this. If we want to reclaim some of the trust of the American people, if we want Americans to have confidence that their government is actually working for them, we have got to address this problem. The first step to any recovery is to recognize the problem, and the fact of the matter is that the institution of Congress is too dependent upon Big Money and special interests. As a result, when it comes time to make public policy, it leans away from the public's interest and in the direction of the special interests.

So what can we do?

A month ago, joined by 128 original cosponsors, I introduced the Government by the People Act. This is a first step. This will not cure all of the ills that bedevil Congress and Washington, and it is not waving a magic wand, but it is an important first step in Americans' being able to say: We want to take our government back from the special interests and Big Money. We want our government to work for us.

The Government by the People Act is premised on the idea that we have to put ordinary Americans—everyday citizens—at the center of the funding of campaigns and take that away from the PACs and the special interests and the Big Money campaign donors. The fact that we had so many cosponsors on this bill at the point of introduction, I think, shows that Members of this institution are hearing from their constituents and understand the anger and frustration that is out there and recognize that they need to do something about it. Let me tell you about the

Government by the People Act because it is really designed to make sure that the voices of everyday citizens are as powerful as the voices of the Big Money campaign donors.

The first thing it does is to provide a \$25 tax credit, what we are calling the My Voice Tax Credit—a \$25 refundable tax credit—to any American who makes a contribution to a congressional campaign in both of the 2 years of the election cycle.

Now, why did we do that?

If you look at the numbers right now, you will see that a very small percentage of Americans actually participates in the funding of campaigns. The funding is dominated by a small group that tends to be of the more wealthy citizens in society, and ordinary Americans out there are not getting into the role of helping to power campaigns on the funding side. We want to encourage them to do that. We want to say to those citizens who want to support a good candidate who is turning to them and listening to their concerns: If you are willing to put \$15 or \$20 or \$25 behind that candidate who stands for the right thing, we will help you do that. We will provide this tax credit to make it a little bit easier for you to step up and be a part of the solution.

So the My Voice Tax Credit does exactly that. It gives a voice back to everyday citizens who feel right now like their voices can't be heard, like they are not empowered to participate in the system, to participate in the solution. That is why we created the My Voice Tax Credit, and that is the first important element of the Government by the People Act.

The second is that we want to make sure that the voice of the everyday citizen can be loud enough to compete with the big money out there, so we created something called the Freedom From Influence Matching Fund. This would provide matching dollars that would come in behind those grassroots donations and boost them up—amplify the voice of the grassroots—so that now those everyday citizens can get the attention of candidates or of Members of Congress who might otherwise be inclined to go spend their time on K Street or on raising money from Big Money campaign donors. Now they have an incentive to go do a house party back in their districts and raise small donations, knowing that those matching funds will come in behind it, and they will be able to raise sufficient dollars to run competitive campaigns.

So we combine those two elements to try to change the way campaigns are funded—the My Voice Tax Credit to promote those small donations, those grassroots donations, and the Freedom From Influence Matching Funds to come in behind it and amplify it so the voices of everyday people can actually be heard, can actually compete with the megaphone that Big Money has and special interests have. That is what the Government by the People Act is designed to do—to empower everyday

citizens to really have a voice again in their own democracy.

The third piece is just as critical. Over the last two election cycles, Americans have seen the spending by super-PACs and by outside groups go through the roof, and they have been turned off by it. They know that there are good candidates who run for office who make a strong case on issues that matter to the public but that they get into those last 60 days—the home stretch of a campaign—and suddenly a super-PAC comes in and pours money into negative advertising, and before you know it that candidate's voice is wiped off the playing field. So we said that, in that home stretch—in those 60 days—we wanted to make sure, of a candidate who chooses to participate in this system, who chooses to reach out to everyday citizens and lift their voices up, that that candidate's own voice would be able to stay in the mix, because that candidate's voice represents the voices of thousands of small donors and other supporters who have stepped up behind him. So, in the last 60 days, candidates who choose to participate in this system would get the benefit of some additional dollars to help them stay in the game, to help keep their voices in the mix, up to Election Day.

There is evidence, Mr. Speaker, to show that, of candidates who work hard to reach out and build relationships with their constituents, if they can get enough dollars in that final stage to stay in the game—to keep their voices there, to keep representing the interests of everyday citizens—then even if a super-PAC or some outside group comes in and throws a lot of money at them, they can still prevail. That is the way it ought to be. Candidates who are doing the right thing—Members of Congress who are trying to serve their constituents and lift up the voices of their constituents—ought to be able to survive the process where some outside group is coming in and trying to wipe them off the face of the map.

So those are the three pieces of the Government by the People Act—the My Voice Tax Credit to encourage and help everyday citizens participate on the funding side of campaigns, a Freedom From Influence Matching Fund that will come in behind that and provide matching dollars to amplify the voices of the grassroots and everyday citizens, and then some extra dollars in that final stretch for participating candidates who suddenly face an attack from a super-PAC or from some other outside group so that their voices and the voices of the people they represent, who have invested in them, can still be heard.

I have talked about why this is so important in terms of changing the perception that Americans have of Washington and Congress, the notion that if everyday citizens feel that Members of Congress can continue to represent them because they are the

ones who powered their campaigns instead of the special interests and Big Money being the ones to underwrite their campaigns that that can begin to restore some confidence. It won't change it overnight—it won't cure all the ills of this place—but it will begin to restore some confidence on the part of everyday citizens that their voices can actually be heard here, that when the campaign is over and governing begins, this institution will continue to listen to them because they are the ones who helped to lift that candidate up on his shoulders.

I want to come at it from another angle for a moment. If you have a system like this that allows a good, strong candidate who knows how to reach out and network in his district to be competitive, you will see a different kind of person coming to Washington. Right now, more than half of the people who serve in Congress are millionaires. That is not surprising because, to run for office, you need a lot of money, and you need to know a lot of people who have a lot of money—that is the reality—but if you have a system where small donors and matching funds can lift up a candidate and power his campaign, you will get people running for Congress and being competitive who in the past would never have had a chance.

I was recently in Maine or in New Hampshire, and I sat on a panel with a legislator from Maine. In Maine, they have a system that helps candidates who reach out to the grassroots be able to assemble the funds to be competitive. This legislator said, but for that system, she would not be a member of the Maine State Legislature because she wouldn't have been able to raise the dollars she needed to run for office and represent the people in her district, but because a system like that existed, she is now in the Maine State Legislature.

I believe that we would see people competing for Congress and succeeding and being elected who right now have no way to access this place, and those are the kinds of people who represent the broad American constituency. Another way to begin restoring people's faith in this institution is if they look here and they say: Do you know what? There is somebody who is a community activist in my district. There is somebody who volunteered at my church who decided to get into politics, who decided to put his name in the ring. Because there is a system for funding campaigns now that combines small donations with matching funds, that person was able to run and compete and be elected. I think that that will lift up many Americans and make them believe that their voices actually make a difference here, that their voices can be heard.

I want to put this in another context as well. There are many things that we can do to try to address the influence of Big Money in our politics. We need more disclosure and transparency in

terms of where these independent expenditures are coming from. I support the DISCLOSE Act, which is sponsored by my colleague, Representative CHRIS VAN HOLLEN of Maryland, because Americans deserve to know where this big money comes from and who is spending it so they can make a judgment about whether that is fair and whether the people to whom that money is going ought to be representing them here in Washington. We need that transparency and we need that disclosure. That is an important reform.

It is important also, I believe, to try to address the decisions of this Supreme Court, in particular the Citizens United decision, which basically took the lid off of outside campaign spending and expenditures by these super-PACs and other independent groups, and has resulted in this flood of negative campaign commercials and advertising to come in in the final weeks and months of the campaign cycle.

□ 1545

So we need to address that.

There are proposals that have been introduced in this body for a constitutional amendment that would rein in the spending of these outside groups. I think we need to address that, too. Those are important measures that we need to undertake. I also think it is critically important that there be something that is part of the reform agenda that has to do with empowering everyday citizens.

If you think about it, disclosure and putting limits on the spending of these outside groups and super PACs is about reining in the conduct and the behavior of the bad actors out there—the people who have kind of gone too far, but we also have to do something to empower and lift up the good actors—everyday citizens who just want to see their government do the right thing and who have commonsense solutions and want the people they elect to Congress to reflect that commonsense perspective.

That is why we need the Government by the People Act. It would create a system that would empower everyday citizens. It would allow them to feel that their voice is being heard and that they are not just standing back as observers watching the titans, the Big Money players, the super PACs sort of duking it out in the ring like two professional wrestlers, but that they can participate.

Everyday citizens could step in the ring and say, You know what? My voice is just as important as the voice of that big donor, and I demand to be heard. That is what that everyday citizen is saying. They want their voice to be heard, but we have got to give them a system that will allow for that.

We called this bill the Government by the People Act because when I, and others, listen to Americans across the country, we hear them saying, We are tired of a government that appears to be of, by, and for the special interests

and the Big Money. Put very simply, we want our government back. We want it back.

The Government by the People Act is an attempt to begin to change business as usual and to create a system that will give government back to the people that it is supposed to represent. That is our only path back to relevancy, in the eyes of the general public. That is our only path back to restoring a trust and confidence that we need as an institution in order to get things done, and let me tell you something: when it comes to relevancy and trust and confidence, we are hanging on by a thread right now.

When you look at the polls and the surveys in terms of what people think about Washington, and they feel that the priorities of this place have become Big Money and special interests, in the minds of most Americans, our relevancy is hanging by a thread.

We need to do something. The Government by the People Act is a reform that can begin to reclaim government and democracy and the political system back for everyday citizens out there that are so frustrated with what is going on.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am optimistic. I am optimistic by nature. I think we can get this reform. When we introduced the bill, we had 128 cosponsors at the point of introduction. We have 140 as of today.

I think Members of this body themselves are at a point where they want to see something different. A lot of Members of Congress are exhausted by the current system. They wish they could raise money a different way. They wish they could run their campaigns and fund their campaigns by turning to the people they represent instead of having to chase the PAC money and the Big Money and the special interests all the time.

There is something wrong with an equation where people go into the voting booth, they pull the lever for you and send you to Washington to represent them, and the day you get to Washington, you have to start representing the Big Money and the special interests because that is the only way you can raise money to fund your campaign.

Let's think about it in those terms. What happens to the franchise when somebody gets here and they have to turn their back on the people who elected them because they have got to go raise the money from someplace else?

What if the place you went to power your campaigns was back to your constituents—everyday citizens—because you had a system that would match their small donations and be able to lift a candidate up and power them forward? That would change the way things operate around here.

I invite people listening to this to go back through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read the statements of Members of the House and the Senate

who announce their retirement and—sometimes within 24 hours—go to the floor of the Senate or the House and talk about the problem of money and politics and how corrosive it has become. Liberated finally from the current system by the fact that they have decided to move on, they are able to stand back and in a clear-eyed and candid way talk about this problem of influence that comes from Big Money and special interests and what it is doing to this place.

I want to read you a quote because I think this really goes right to the heart of the matter. People are fed up with the gridlock and dysfunction here. We can connect a lot of that to this issue of money and politics.

Let me read you a quote from 1982:

When political action committees give money, they expect something in return other than good government. It is making it much more difficult to legislate. We may reach a point where if everybody is buying something with PAC money, we can't get anything done.

Do you know who said that in 1982? Robert Dole, the minority leader at that time and a Republican Member of the U.S. Senate. That was in 1982.

The influence of Big Money on our politics and on our governing has metastasized since then, but even then, on the front edge of this trend, Bob Dole could see what it would do to the institution, and he was lamenting it.

So a public that is upset about gridlock and dysfunction of this place needs a solution that will address the influence Big Money has here. Because that will help, I think, change the whole way in which we operate. Other Members have made similar comments, as I mentioned a moment ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am optimistic. I think we have a good piece of legislation. I think it goes to the heart and tries to address a lot of the cynicism that so many Americans have out there that their voice can't be heard.

I want to mention that we have at this stage over 40 national organizations who have gotten behind this legislation. This is a new development. We have had reform bills in the past—good ones—but they didn't have that kind of broad support from grassroots organizations across the country—civil rights groups like the NAACP; environmental groups like the Sierra Club and Green Peace; labor groups who have been out there trying to address the issues of working families, like CWA and others.

Why are they coming to this? Because they figured out what the American people have figured out. The good things they want to see when it comes to the environment or to creating jobs or to making sure people are treated fairly in this society, all those good things are being thwarted by the influence that Big Money has over the way this institution operates.

So they are coming to this fight now, saying, If we care about the environment, if we care about jobs, if we care about economic justice, we have to

adopt reforming the way campaigns are funded as part of our own efforts.

Already, within the first 3 or 4 weeks since we introduced the bill, over 400,000 citizen cosponsors from across the country have signed petitions supporting the Government by the People Act because they understand that this reform is meaningful and will make a difference.

So I am optimistic that we can get this done. We are not going to get it done tomorrow. We are not going to get it done next week. But with the opportunity to channel in a constructive way some of this anger and cynicism and frustration that the American people are feeling right now that their voice is not heard, if we have a vehicle to channel that and organize it into a strong momentum, then when the opportunity presents itself to actually achieve this reform, I think we can do it.

I think that if we don't do it, Americans will finally turn away completely from this place and say, You can't help us any more.

That is what is at stake here: the relevancy of this institution and the relevancy of this, the people's House, to the people, and until we address the problem of the influence of Big Money over our system, we are not going to be able to reclaim the confidence and the trust of the American people.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I close, I wanted to tell the story of a person in my district. A couple of years ago, he came to one of my house parties. He is a longtime supporter of mine. He came up to me after the House party was over and said, Look, I would like to contribute \$25 to your campaign.

He said, I can't do more than that. I can't afford more than that, but I would like to do it. I would be proud to do it. I just don't know if it will make a difference. Will it matter?

He was, I think, saying what many Americans are saying, which is, Do our voices count? Can we really compete with the Big Money out there? Is anybody listening to us?

That is what he was saying to me.

If we can pass legislation like the Government by the People Act and create a new way of funding our campaign that puts everyday citizens in the middle of the equation, make them the ones to sort of solve this problem for us, and empower them, then I will be able to say to constituents like that person who came up to me and was feeling marginalized by the current system, Not only are you relevant, not only is your voice important, your voice is the most important part of the way we power campaigns in this country.

That is the message we need to send. That is the outreach we need to do.

So we can move with this legislation from a system of politics, a democracy that is too often of, by, and for the Big

Money campaign donors and the special interests, to a government that truly is of, by, and for the people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF CERTAIN PERSONS CONTRIBUTING TO THE SITUATION IN UKRAINE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-95)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAMER) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in Ukraine.

The order does not target the country of Ukraine, but rather is aimed at persons—including persons who have asserted governmental authority in the Crimean region without the authorization of the Government of Ukraine—who undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets. The order blocks the property and interests in property and suspends entry into the United States of any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

- to be responsible for or complicit in, or to have engaged in, directly or indirectly, any of the following:
 - actions or policies that undermine democratic processes or institutions in Ukraine;
 - actions or policies that threaten the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, or territorial integrity of Ukraine; or
 - misappropriation of state assets of Ukraine or of an economically significant entity in Ukraine;
- to have asserted governmental authority over any part or region of Ukraine without the authorization of the Government of Ukraine;
- to be a leader of an entity that has, or whose members have, engaged in any activity described above or of an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order;
- to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any activity described above or any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order; or
- to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on

behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 6, 2014.

□ 1600

MARCH 6 FROM A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is March 6, and I want to talk about March 6 in a historical perspective, history that is very important that Americans know about.

Yesterday, on the House floor, I talked about the things that are going on in the Ukraine and compared Mr. Putin's aggressive actions toward Europe, similar to the actions of Adolf Hitler and the Nazis.

Before I do that today, I would like to yield some time to two of our Members who have discussions on other issues. First, I would like to yield as much time as he wishes to consume on a different issue to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

STUTTERING FOUNDATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss something very close to me. I want to talk about stuttering. I have been a lifelong stutterer, and when I was young I experienced some very difficult times, but that is a story really for another day.

More than 70 million people stutter. One in every 100 people in the world stutter. In the U.S., more than 3 million Americans stutter. You probably have a friend, a neighbor, a classmate, a coworker, or a family member who stutters. Most people do.

About 5 percent of all children go through a stuttering phase that lasts 6 months or more. Some will recover by late childhood, but one out of every 100 children will be left with long-term stuttering.

I would like to take this time to tell you a little bit more about stuttering, what it is and how family members and friends can help.

Stuttering is a disorder where the flow of speech is broken by repetition, prolongations, or abnormal stoppages

of sounds and syllables. For some people, unusual facial and body movements may happen when they try to speak.

Stuttering is most likely caused by four factors:

One, Genetics;

Two, child development. For example, children with other speech and language problems or developmental delays are more likely to stutter;

Three, the makeup of the brain. An ongoing research study by Dr. Anne Smith with the Purdue University Stuttering Project shows that people who stutter seem to process speech and language differently than those who don't;

And four, lastly, family dynamics have an impact. High expectations and fast-paced lifestyles can also contribute to stuttering.

People who stutter are no different from those who do not stutter. In fact, studies by Dr. Ehud Yairi at the University of Illinois show that people who stutter are as intelligent and as well-adjusted as those who don't.

Contrary to what many people believe, stuttering can be treated. I want to let anyone know out there who stutters or who has a child who stutters, much can be done.

Speech-language pathologists, therapists trained to help deal with speech issues like stuttering often work in schools, clinics, at universities, and in private practice to help treat stuttering.

The most important thing, and many experts agree: early intervention is key. The earlier we can identify stuttering in our children and get them the help they need, the better chances we have at helping them to speak more fluently.

If you stutter, or if a child or loved one stutters, or if you even think they might be stuttering, get help immediately.

One of the best ways to help is by visiting the Stuttering Foundation. The foundation was started by Malcolm Fraser more than 70 years ago. His book, called "Self-Therapy for the Stutterer," was originally published in 1978, and still is one of the best books on stuttering available.

You can visit the foundation's Web site at www.stutteringhelp.org. They have lots of well-trusted, expert information available for free, including Malcolm Fraser's book, as well as countless brochures and videos and other materials for parents and teachers.

Unfortunately, there is no instant miracle cure for stuttering, no surgery, no pills, no intensive weekend retreats. Stuttering takes time and effort and commitment to work through.

Some people outgrow it. Some people respond well to years of therapy and learn to speak fluently, with almost no trace of difficulty. For many others, stuttering becomes a lifelong struggle, as it has for me.